

REMARKS

In the above-mentioned Office Action, all of the pending claims, claims 1-15, were rejected. Claims 1-3 and 13-15 were rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of Coverdale and Shah. Claims 4-7 and 10-12 were rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of Coverdale, Shah, and Detlef. Claim 5 was rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of Coverdale, Shah, and Champness. Claim 8 was rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of Coverdale, Shah, Detlef, and Besharat. And, claim 9 was rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of Shah, Detlaf, and Obayashi.

Responsive to the rejections of the claims, independent claims 1, 6, and 13 have been amended in manners believed better to distinguish the invention of the present application over the references cited thereagainst, taken alone or in any combination. And, dependent claims 2 and 14 have been cancelled.

With respect to exemplary claim one, the claim has now been amended to recite that the output provided during said step of providing is of a first type when the received signal has met the predetermined threshold and is otherwise of a second type, different than the first, type. Claims 6 and 13 have been analogously amended.

The Examiner relies upon Coverdale for disclosing the providing of an output correlated to the results of an inspection of the received signal for determining quality. While the Examiner acknowledged that Coverdale fails to disclose a signal quality indicated in terms of an acceptable percentage, the Examiner relies upon Shah for disclosing a wireless communication system that evaluates a quality of service by analyzing the BER percentage.

Review of Coverdale, however, indicates that this reference fails to provide a manner, or step, of providing an output as now recited. Namely, Coverdale fails to disclose providing an output of different types, depending upon the comparison of a received signal with a predetermined threshold, as recited now in the claims, as amended. And, while Shah makes reference to a BER detection, the reference also fails to disclose a manner by which to provide an output of the different types, as now recited. The other references, i.e., Detlaf, Champness, Besharat, and Obayahshi, were not relied upon for showing such method or structure, and

Appl. No. 09/454,124
Amdt. dated 16 Oct. 2003
Reply to Office Action of 16 Jul. 2003

similarly, can not be combined together to form the invention as recited now in the claims, as amended.


The remaining ones of the dependent claims, which include all of the limitations of their respective parent claims, are believed to be patentably distinguishable over any of the combinations of references for the same reasons as those given with respect to their respective parent claims.

In view of the foregoing, independent claims 1, 6, and 13, as now amended, and the remaining ones of the dependent claims, are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration for allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any questions or desire clarification of any sort, or deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 16, 2003


Robert H. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,922

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.
5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400
Dallas, Texas 75225
Telephone: (214) 706-4200
Fax: (214) 706-4242